Application No.: 09/746,174 Attorney Docket No.: EMC2-085PUS
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In above identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and re-examination are hereby requested.

Claim 6 have been amended to remove Examiner's objection.

Claim 1 has been canceled

Claim 2 points out that the method includes comparing such generated parity with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data. It is respectfully submitted that Leitch does not compare the generated parity of the parity bits of the plurality of data bytes with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data.

More particularly, the Examiner indicates that Leitch teaches vertical and horizontal parity. Parity is an LRC function, f(x), and is used twice: once in the vertical direction and once in the horizontal direction. The Examiner alleges that Ramabadran teaches that LRC is a form of CRC because it has a polynomial $x^n + 1$, so Leitch is performing a CRC.

However, neither reference, whether taken separately or together, teach that *different* polynomials can be used as a validation of the other. Applicant teaches that one function f(x) can be used in the vertical direction (this is CRC) and another function g(x) can be used in the horizontal direction (this is parity) and that the function g(x) is compared with the parity of the other function f(x). That is, with Applicant's method as set forth in claim 2, Applicant compares the generated parity of the parity bits of the plurality of data bytes with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data. It is respectfully submitted that Leitch does not compare the generated parity of the parity bits of the plurality of data bytes with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data.

Claim 3 points out that the method includes comparing the parity of the byte data parity bits with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data. It is respectfully submitted that Leitch either singly or in combination does not describe or suggest comparing the parity of the byte data parity bits with the ***parity bit of the CRC*** of the data.

Claim 4 points out that the method included comparing the computed parity of the

Application No.: 09/746,174 Attorney Docket No.: EMC2-085PUS
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2004

plurality of N bytes of the data with a parity bit of the CRC of the data. It is respectfully submitted that Leitch either singly or in combination does not describe or suggest comparing the computed parity of the plurality of N bytes of the data with a parity bit of the CRC of the data.

Claim 5 points out that the method includes comparing the computing the parity with the parity bit p of the CRC of the data. It is respectfully submitted that Leitch either singly or in combination does not describe or suggest comparing the computing the parity with the parity bit p of the CRC of the data.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

In the event any additional fee is required, please charge such amount to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

11-3-04
Date

Richard M. Sharkansky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 25,800
P. O. Box 557
Mashpee. MA 02649
Telephone: (508) 477-4311
Facsimile: (508) 477-7234